## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5, 9, 10, 13 to 20 and 22 to 24 continue to be in the case.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 21 are being cancelled.

New claims 25 to 30 are being introduced.

Claim 1 is currently amended based on the language of US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [17] and the drawing Fig. 1.

Claim 5 is being amended by incorporating language from claims 6, 7, and 8.

Claim 16 is currently amended based on the language of US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraphs [17] and [23].

New claim 25 is based on the language of US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [17].

New claim 26 is based on the language of US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [17] and [18].

New claim 27 is based on the language of US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [18].

New claim 28 is based on the language of claims 16 and 17.

New claim 29 is based on the language of claim 17.

New claim 30 is based on the language of claim 9 and on US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [22].

***The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102.***

Claims 1, 2,11,12,15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andersen (US 5,773,943).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Andersen teaches a drive device for passage barriers (abstract) or thoroughfare barriers and door or gate drives, having a brushless DC servo motor, characterized in that the DC servo motor (fig. 2,11) has an associated servo controller (fig. 9, 50) and the output shaft (fig. 3, 8) of the DC servo motor is connected directly to the drive shaft (fig. 3,4) of the barrier element.

According to the reference Andersen, Column 5, lines 46 to 49 "In this embodiment, a coupling 14 has been used which is positively and non-positively connected on one hand with the worm gearing 9 and on the other hand with the shaft 8. ". Thus the "output shaft (fig. 3, 8) of the DC servo motor" according to the Andersen reference is not directly connected to the DC servo motor at all, but is instead connected to the worm gearing 9 according to the Andersen reference.

The Andersen reference states in column 7, lines 25 to 30: "that there is an electromechanical drive unit 10 which consists of an electric motor 11 with a worm gearing 9 connected on the side, and the drive shaft of the rotating part 1 is connected positively and non-positively directly with the worm gearing 9". While the reference Andersen teaches that the worm gearing 9 is disposed between the electric motor 11 and the drive shaft of the

rotating part 1, in contrast claim 1 of the present application requires that the output shaft of the brushless DC servo motor is connected directly to the drive shaft of the barrier element (2).

The drive device for a revolving door described in the reference Andersen (U.S. patent 5,773,943) comprises expressly an electric motor 11 with the worm gear 9, wherein the electric motor 11 is placed close to the worm gear on the same horizontal plane and wherein the worm gear 9 is disposed between the motor and the drive shaft 8 of the revolving door. The electric motor 11 together with the worm gear 9 forms the drive device or drive unit 10 (compare for example the reference Andersen column 1, lines 61 to 66, column 5, lines 18 to 21, column 6, lines 21 to 23, column 7, lines 25 and 26, column 10 lines 8 to 11 and lines 15 and 16 and lines 34 to 36 and lines 48 to 51 and lines 60 to 67). In addition, embodiments are described by the Andersen reference with an additional coupling drive 14, wherein the coupling drive 14 is interposed between the worm gearing 9 and the drive shaft 8 of the revolving door (compare the reference Andersen column 5, lines 33 to 36 and lines 46 to 49) or with two worm gears 9a, 9b connected in series (reference Andersen, column 4, lines 31 to 33 and column 6, lines 51 to 57), wherein the second worm gear 9b can again be

connected to the drive shaft 8 of the revolving door through a coupling gear 14.

One can only take from this reference Andersen that at least one worm gear is necessary for the drive of the revolving door; there is no location in the Andersen reference suggesting to completely dispense with a worm gear and to connect the output shaft of the electric motor directly with the drive shaft of the revolving door. The figures 2, 3, and 9 of the Andersen reference referred to by the Office Action also contain the worm gear 9, or, respectively, 9a and 9b and the coupling drive 14 together with their reference characters. The reference Andersen mentions in column 7, line 14 that the drive motor can be for example a brushless DC electric motor. This brushless DC electric motor however is part of the drive device or drive unit 10, which drive unit 10 here again comprises the electric motor 11 and the worm gearing 9 (Andersen reference, column 7, lines 25 and 26). The drive shaft of the revolving door 1 is connected form matching and force matching with the worm gear 9 (Andersen reference, column 7 lines 27 to 29). In clear contrast, the output shaft of the brushless DC servo motor of the present application is connected directly to the drive shaft of the barrier element 2 and without any intermediate gearing.

The servo controller coordinated to the brushless DC servo motor 5 makes it possible according to the present invention to dispense with a worm gearing between the output shaft of the brushless DC servomotor 5 and the drive shaft for the barrier element 2.

The present amendment changes claim 1 to further distinguish from the reference Andersen: An output shaft of the DC servo motor (5) is connected directly and without an interconnection of a gear mechanism to the drive shaft of a barrier element (2). The gear connection recited in the Office Action is now expressly excluded by the claim language of claim 1. Similar to claim 1, claims 15 and 25 now also require a direct shaft connection between an electric motor and the barrier element 2.

Claim 1 as amended requires in addition "a horizontal plate (3), wherein the DC-servo motor is attached from below to the horizontal plate (3);". There is no horizontal plate shown in the reference Andersen, to which the DC-servo motor is attached from below.

Claim 1 as amended further requires: "wherein the output shaft penetrates through the horizontal plate (3) and is attached to a vertical edge of the barrier element (2);". The reference Andersen fails to teach that an output shaft penetrates through the horizontal plate or that the output shaft is attached to a vertical edge of the barrier element.

Claim 1 as amended further requires a "a post (1) attached to an upper side of the horizontal plate (3) and surrounding the drive shaft in an area disposed above the horizontal plate (3).". No such post is taught or suggested in the Andersen reference.

Consequently claim 1 as amended is clearly novel in view of the Andersen reference.

With respect to claim 2, Andersen teaches a compact complete control device which comprises the servo controller (fig. 9, 50) and a logic section (fig. 9, 52) and a housing (fig. 3,18), and which serves to control (column 7, lines 5-15) the motor as a function of signals.

Claim 2 as amended calls for a "housing not containing the DC-servo motor", whereas in contrast the motor of the Andersen reference is contained in the housing 18.

Claim 2 further requires that "a rotation axis of the output shaft of the DC servo motor (5) coincides with a rotation axis of the drive shaft of the barrier element (2)". Fig. 6 of the Andersen reference shows that the shaft of the electric motor 11 does not coincide with the axis of shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1. In particular the reference Andersen in column 6, lines 46 to 49 states: "Here again, the drive unit 10 includes the electric motor 11 and

the worm gearing 9, and the output shaft of the worm gearing 9 may be rotationally coupled via a coupling 14 with the shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1 of the revolving door." This language confirms that the axis of the motor is different located from the position of the axis of the shaft 8 in clear contrast to the requirement of claim 2.

With respect to claim 11, Andersen teaches in that a linkage (fig. 3, 14) can be interconnected between the servo motor and the barrier element which is to be moved (column 5, lines 45-62).

The present amendment cancels claim 11.

With respect to claim 12, Andersen teaches in that a step-down gear mechanism (fig. 3, 9) and a linkage (fig. 3,14) can be interconnected between the servo motor and the element which is to be moved (column 5, lines 45-62).

The present amendment cancels claim 12.

With respect to claim 15, Andersen teaches drive device for passage barriers or thoroughfare barriers and door or gate drives, comprising a brushless DC servo motor (fig. 2,11); an output shaft (fig. 3, 8) formed at the brushless DC servo motor and having an axis (fig. 3, dash line down 4 and 8); a barrier element (astract); a drive shaft (fig. 3,4) formed at the barrier element and having an axis (fig. 3, dash line down 4 and 8), wherein the output shaft of the brushless DC servo motor is solidly attached to the drive shaft formed at the barrier element (fig. 1,1) and wherein the axis of the output shaft and the axis of the of the drive shaft coincide (fig. 3); a servo controller (fig. 9, 50) connected to the brushless DC servo motor.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to column 6 of the reference Andersen, the electric motor 11 is connected through the worm gearing 9 to the coupling 14 and the shaft 8. The axis of the worm gearing 9 and the rotation axis driven by the worm cannot be coinciding, but they have to be spaced apart and under an angle. With the worm gearing 9 disposed in between the output shaft of the electric motor 11 and the drive shaft 8 of the revolving door of the reference Andersen, the output shaft of the electric motor 11 cannot be solidly and directly connected to the drive shaft 8. Therefore the requirements of claim 15 are not taught by the Andersen reference.

Claim 15 as amended further distinguishes over the Andersen reference.

Claim 15 requires a horizontal plate (3) having a hole and that the brushless DC servo motor (5) is mounted from below to the horizontal plate (3). No such horizontal plate (3) with a motor attached from below is seen in the reference Andersen. Claim 15 as amended further specifies that the output shaft formed at the brushless DC servo motor (5) extends through the hole in the horizontal plate (3) to an upper side of the plate (3) and has an axis. The reference Andersen fails to teach an output shaft extending through a hole in a plate. Furthermore claim 15 requires that the barrier element (2) is disposed on the upper side of the horizontal plate (3). The reference Anderson does not teach a barrier element disposed on the upper side of a horizontal plate (3).

***The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.***

Claims 3-10,13,14, and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen (US 5,773,943) in view of Becker (US 5,245,258).

The reference Anderson is respectfully traversed as set forth above.

With respect to claim 3, Andersen does not teach characterized in that the logic section is designed as a pluggable logic circuit board. Becker teaches in that the logic section is designed as a pluggable logic (fig. 2, 5) circuit board. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board to the motor control system of Anderson for the advantage of to accomplish an easily installed assembly which can be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55; column 7, lines 34-52).

The reference Becker et al teaches an electrically powered power window unit and the reference Andersen teaches a drive device for a revolving door.

Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine such divergent disclosures to obtain the pedestrian barrier of the present invention. It sounds like magic: Take a revolving door and combine with window operating system and you will obtain a pedestrian barrier. Applicant urges that the controls for a revolving door are substantially different from controls of an electrically powered power window unit and that after substituting the controls of the revolving door with the controls of the power window, that then the revolving door would cease to function. After such substitution, there would be no sensing of the pedestrian position or no sensing of a contact of the revolving door with a person passing through the revolving door.

With respect to claim 4, Andersen does not teach that different logic circuit boards can be plug-connected, different movement profiles and programs which are directed at various applications are prespecified on said logic circuit boards, and said logic circuit boards have different numbers of inputs and outputs and different operator control and display elements, depending on requirements. Becker teaches different logic circuit boards can be plug-connected, different movement profiles and programs which are directed at various applications are prespecified on said logic circuit boards, and said logic circuit boards have different numbers of inputs and outputs and different operator control and display elements, depending on requirements (column 5, lines 49-55; column 7, lines 46-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant urges that substituting the control unit 50 of the Andersen reference by the plug-in module 5 of the reference Becker et al. would result in a non functioning drive device for a revolving door. All the teaching of Becker et al. are directed to an electrically powered power windows unit and would not drive a revolving door.

The Office Action recites the reference Becker et al. in column 5, lines 49 to 55 as follows: "The plug-in module 5 consists of plug-in element 6, on which the electronic control and regulating system 4, including a micro-computer 40, are mounted. The micro-computer 40 can be programmed as desired, depending on the motor vehicle type in which it is installed.". Thus the reference Becker et al. teaches a system for windows in motor vehicles and such system would certainly

malfunction when implanted in a drive device for a revolving door and certainly would not yield a control system for a pedestrian barrier.

The Office Action recites further the reference Becker et al. in column 7, lines 46 to 52: "Finally, due to the modular design, all sorts of electronic devices can be located on the plug-in module, so that jamming protection circuits or regulating circuits for raising or lowering of the window, as well as a combination of window controls with a central locking system is possible." The reference Becker et al. makes it clear that the devices of the reference are suitable in connection with circuits for raising or lowering windows and no suggestion is provided to install the circuits for raising or lowering of the window in drive devices for revolving doors or for that matter for pedestrian barriers.

With respect to claim 5 and 19, Andersen does not teach a transmitter system which is integrated in the motor and supplies the required control signals. Becker teaches teach a transmitter system (fig. 2, 4) which is integrated in the motor and supplies the required control signals (column 5, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board/control system that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

The reference Becker et al. in column 5, lines 49 to 54 teaches an electronic control and regulating system 4, including a micro-computer 40, which can be programmed as desired, depending on the motor vehicle type in which it is installed. Thus there is no indication in the reference Becker et al. that the electronic control and regulating system 4 will properly control and regulate a

revolving door (of the reference Andersen) or a pedestrian barrier according to the present invention. Even if it would be possible to incorporate an electronic control and regulating system according to the reference Becker et al. into the construction of the Andersen reference or into the pedestrian barrier according to the present invention, there is no indication that such incorporation would result in an operable unit.

With respect to claim 6, and 20, Andersen and Becker do not teach in that the motor mount is formed as a fixed mount on the side of the transmitter system. Becker discloses the claimed invention except for the fixed mount. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the circuit assembly fixed, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works,* 150 U.S. 164 (1993).

Claim 6 is canceled in the present amendment. The language of claim 6 is now incorporated in claim 5.

Claim 20 as amended requires that "a motor mount formed on the bottom side of the horizontal plate (3) as a fixed mount on the side of the transmitter system.". There is no horizontal plate (3) in either one of the references Andersen or Becker et al. nor are there two pieces in the references forming one horizontal plate as alleged in the Office Action.

With respect to claim 7 and 21, Andersen does not teach in that the transmitter system is connected to the motor plate by means of plug connection or clamping. Becker teaches the transmitter system is connected to the motor plate (fig. 2, 26) by means of plug connection (fig. 2,11,12; column 6, lines 45-51) or clamping. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

Claim 7 and 21 are canceled in the present amendment. The language of claim 7 is now introduced in claim 5.

A pluggable logic circuit board does not have to be programmable. A circuit board able to be programmed might be more costly than a regular circuit board and therefore may not be that suitable in situations where programmability is not required.

According to the reference Becker et al., column 6, line 65, the element 26 is a connector and not a motor plate. The plug contacts 11,12 of the reference Becker et al. are for the power supply of the drive unit. The plug connection of the present application connects the transmitter system to the motorplate. The reference Becker et al. apparently does not provide for a plug connection to the motor plate.

With respect to claim 8 and 22, Andersen does not teach in that the plug connection is designed to be secure against polarity reversal and is provided with a locking means. Becker teaches the plug connection is designed to be secure against polarity reversal and is provided with a locking means (column 7, lines 46-52). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired such as locking means, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

The present amendment cancels claim 8. The language of claim 8 has now been incorporated in claim 5.

The locking unit 6 of the present application holds the barrier element 2 securely in its closed position and its open position and allows the motor 5 and, respectively, the barrier element 2 to stop at any position according to US Patent Application Publication 2007/0246324 A1, paragraph [17].

Claim 22 of the present application requires that "a locking unit (6) is connected to the barrier element (2).".

The recitation of the Becker et al. reference at column 7, lines 46 to 52 refers at the end to a combination of window controls with a central locking system. The reference does not indicate where the "central locking system" pertains to. However, since the reference Becker et al. refers to windows in a motor vehicle one would assume that the "central locking system" pertains to the door locks of a motor vehicle. There is nothing in the reference Becker et al. which says that the plug-in module 5 is being able to be programmed for a "central (door) locking system".

There is no suggestion or teaching in the reference Becker et al. which connects the "central (door) locking system" to a barrier element or to a flap.

Claim 21 of the instant application further requires that "the locking unit (6) holds the barrier element (2) securely in its closed position and its open position and allowing the brushless DC servo motor (2) to stop in any position, and wherein the plug connection is constructed to be secure against polarity reversal.". A central door locking system of a motor vehicle will not provide the features set forth in claim 21. The central door lock system of a motor vehicle will not hold the door securely in an open position or allow a servo motor to stop in any position in contrast to the requirement of claim 21 of the present application.

With respect to claim 9 and 23, Anderson does not teach a commutation and position control in the motor are performed by means of a magnetoresistive sensor. Becker teaches a commutation and position control (column 6, lines 25-40) in the motor are performed by means of a magnetoresistive sensor (column 6, lines 25-27;"inductive measuring device"). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a sensor to provide the advantage of getting feedback of speed/position signals, as taught by Becker.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The reference Becker et al. in column 6, lines 25 to 27 states: "This speed measurement is preferably accomplished by means of a contact-free Hall sensor or a photo-electric or inductive measuring device.". Thus the reference performs a speed measurement. In clear contrast to the reference Becker et al., claim 23 of this application requires "the magnetoresistive sensor is connected to the servo motor for performing

commutation and position control in the brushless DC servo motor (5).". While the reference Becker et al. measures a speed, claims 9 and 23 refer to commutation and position control in the brushless DC servo motor.

With respect to claim 10, Andersen does not teach commutation and position control in the motor are performed by means of resolvers or encoders or Hall sensors. Becker teaches a commutation and position control (column 6, lines 25-40) in the motor are performed by means of resolvers or encoders or Hall sensors (fig. 2, 31, 32).

While claim 10 of the instant application is concerned with commutation and position control, the reference Becker et al. is concerned about measuring speed and is thus teaching away from the present invention.

With respect to claim 13, Andersen does not teach in that the inputs and outputs are separate from the actual motor control system/logic circuit board and designed as an independent module. Becker teaches the inputs and outputs are separate from the actual motor control system (fig. 2, 21, 22)/logic circuit board and designed as an independent module (fig. 2, 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board with various input/outputs that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

The reference Becker et al. teaches in column 5, lines 28 to 33: "FIG. 2 shows the integrated assembly in a common housing 1 consisting of a drive unit 21 and 22 as well as a plug-in module 5, which contains the electronic control and regulating system 4 as well the contact device for the power supply of the drive unit and parts of the speed sensor.". Thus the reference Becker et al.

teaches that the contact device for the power supply of the drive unit is part of an integrated assembly. This is in contrast to the allegation in the Office Action that "Becker teaches the inputs and outputs are separate from the actual motor control system (fig 2,21,22)/ logic circuit board and designed as an independent module (fig. 2,6).". It is respectfully submitted that the contact device for the power supply for the drive unit cannot at the same time be part of the integrated assembly as stated by the reference Becker et al. and designed as independent module as required by claim 13 of the instant application.

Applicant agrees with the Office Action that Andersen does not teach that the inputs and outputs are separate from the actual motor control system/logic circuit board and designed as an independent module.

With respect to claim 14, Andersen does not teach in that the inputs and outputs can be connected by a pluggable bus connection or a pluggable, multicore cable. Becker teaches the inputs and outputs can be connected by a pluggable bus connection or a pluggable, multicore cable (column 7, lines 10-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a pluggable logic board with multiple pins/cables/control signals that has the advantage of being able to be programmed, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

Applicant agrees that the reference Andersen does not teach that the inputs and outputs can be connected by a pluggable bus connection or a pluggable, multicore cable. The reference Becker et al. in column 7, lines 10 to 52 also fails to teach inputs and outputs, which can be connected by a pluggable bus connection or a pluggable, multicore cable. The reference Becker et al. in column

7, lines 11 to 15 states "Not shown in greater detail are mating contacts in the connector 26 which are used to establish a connection to a contact device 70 having several connecting pins, which are connected to the electronic control and regulating system 4 of the circuit board 6.". No connection of inputs and outputs is furnished by the reference Becker et al..

With respect to claim 16, Andersen teaches a logic section (fig. 9, 52) connected to the servo controller; a housing (fig. 3,18) surrounding the servo controller and the logic section, wherein the servo controller, the logic section, and the housing form a compact complete control device which serves to control the brushless DC servo motor as a function of signals (column 5, lines 45-62). Anderson does not teach wherein the servo controller is furnished as a circuit board. Becker teaches a circuit board (fig. 2, 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a circuit board with plug in capabilities that has the advantage of being able to be programmed as desired, as taught by Becker (column 5, lines 49-55).

It is respectfully submitted that the Andersen reference teaches a revolving door, which may be installed once and no programming as desired is desirable, in particular where associated with additional costs. Also use of a circuit board is not generally associated with an additional possibility to program the circuit board.

Applicant is now amending claim 16 to better distinguish over the references applied in the Office Action.

***The Office Action refers to Response to Arguments.***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/19/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's first argument is that the revolving door of Anderson is not a drive device for passage barrier. The examiner disagrees, claim 1 reads "passage barrier or thoroughfare barrier and door or gate drive", which Anderson invention teaches. The applicant is arguing a narrower description than is present.

Applicant is now submitting claim 25 with language referring to a flap (2), which should better distinguish over the revolving door of the reference Andersen.

Applicant's second argument is that Anderson does not teach the output shaft of the motor connected directly to the drive shaft of the barrier. The examiner disagrees, (column 5, lines 60-62) the output shaft of the motor (fig. 3, 8) is directly connected to the drive shaft of the barrier (fig. 3,4). Anderson invention does contain a worm gear which is connected to the motor, not between the output shaft and barrier shaft.

The reference Andersen in column 6, lines 44 to 50 states: "In FIG. 6, there is illustrated an installation of the inventive revolving door mounted substantially immediately above a floor 6 of a building. Here again, the drive unit 10 includes the electric motor 11 and the worm gearing 9, and the output shaft of the worm gearing 9 may be rotationally coupled via a coupling 14 to a shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1 of the revolving door.".

Thus there is a sequence of elements according to the reference Andersen:

Electric motor 11,

Worm of the worm gearing 9 engaged by the output shaft of the electric motor 11,

Output shaft of the worm gearing 9,

Coupling 14 attached to the output shaft of the worm gearing 9,

Shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1 attached to the coupling 14.

Thus the output shaft of the electric motor is not visible in the drawings of the reference Andersen, only the electric motor 11 and the worm gearing 9 are shown.

The citation in the Office Action of reference Andersen, column 5, lines 60 to 62 reads as follows: "The center column 4 can either be directly connected to the shaft 8, or the connection can also be made by means of an additional coupling element. ". This does not say that shaft 8 is the output shaft of the electric motor and in fact shaft 8 is not the output shaft of the electric motor 11.

The reference Andersen in column 6, lines 51 through 57 reads as follows: "FIG. 7 shows another embodiment of the drive unit 10 of the inventive revolving door, wherein the electric motor 11 is coupled to two worm gearing units 9a and 9b which are connected in series to the output of the electric motor 11. The output shaft of the final worm gearing unit 9b may be connected via a coupling 14 to a shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1 of the revolving door.". This makes it clear that according to the reference Andersen "the electric motor 11 (with its output shaft) is coupled to a worm gearing unit 9a", which worm gearing 9a is connected to the output of the electric motor 11. The output shaft of the (final) worm gearing (unit 9b) may be connected via a coupling 14 to a shaft 8 for rotating the rotating part 1 of the revolving door. There is stated again in the Anderson reference: The input of the worm gearing unit 9a is connected to the output (shaft) of the

motor 11 and the output shaft of the worm gearing is connected via a coupling 14 to the drive shaft 8. Thus there is no direct connection between the output shaft of the motor 11 and the drive shaft 8. There are the intermediate members worm gearing 9 and coupling 14.

Applicant's third argument is that the servo controller in claim 2 has a different function than Anderson's controller. The claim language does not read further in detail of the functionality of the controller. Anderson controller reads on the present claim language.

Applicant understands what the Office Action is saying here with respect to the claim language.

Applicant's fourth argument is against a typographical error in claim 12. The linkage connection is labeled correctly in claim 11, as fig. 3,14 but was mislabeled in claim 12.

Applicant is canceling claim 12 in the present amendment.

In response to applicant's fifth argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine,* 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones,* 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both are electrically driven barriers containing motors, and similar hardware control setups.

The present application and the Andersen reference refer to electric motors and barriers. However, a turnstile or pedestrian passage is substantially different from a revolving door. And a power window is still more remote in its subject

matter. There is no way of substituting any one of pedestrian barrier, revolving door, or motor vehicle window drive for the other in a practical application.

Applicant's sixth argument is that is would have not been obvious in view of the Becker reference. Again the examiner has different reason for combining which have been included and are in the same field of endeavor.

A pedestrian barrier, a revolving door, or a motor vehicle window drive are clearly not in the same field of endeavor. Usually different manufacturers are concerned with pedestrian barriers, revolving doors, or motor vehicle window drives. There are different suppliers and different routes of trade or distribution for each one of a pedestrian barrier, a revolving door, or a motor vehicle window drive. Pedestrian barriers are for example purchased by airports, revolving doors are purchased by super markets, or a motor vehicle window drives are purchased by car manufacturers, which are all different organizations having different requirements.

With respect to claim 8, the applicant argues that the locking means of Becker is different than that of the reference. Again the applicant is arguing about something that is not present in the claim language.

The present amendment cancels claim 8 and introduces the language of claim 8 in claim 5. According to the claims 8 and now claim 5 of the present application the plug connection is provided with a locking means, wherein the plug connection connects the transmitter system to the motor plate.

With respect to claim 13, the applicant argues that the rejection is not understood. The claim language is difficult to understand of what is separate from each other. The examiner

interpreted the claim to mean the input and output shafts are seperate from the motor control system and logic circuit board which is an independent module.

Applicant noted only that there is nothing said in the reference Becker et al. that the inputs and outputs are separate from the actual motor control system/logic circuit board and form an independent module.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Lothar Lais

By: Horst M Kasper

Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059

Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: ERT208A@

Rep/am